

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/717,676 | BARTZ ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tuan A. Vu | 2193 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) _____.

(2) Ken Eiferman. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 May 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative was approached to the effect of adding some proposed limitations suggested by Examiner in order to put the entire claimed invention in better condition for allowance. After discussing on how to specify the level of documents for the basis for effecting the text comparison as described from the claimed steps of claim 1, it was agreed that adding specifics to the above-mentioned level(s) and expand this change to all independent claims would suffice to improve the invention so that it would be closer to an possible allowance..